

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of November 13, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Notably, Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, however, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 4 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention and to expedite prosecution. Applicants respectfully note, however, that the amendments to the claims are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application. Also, Applicants have submitted new Claims 26-41. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

Regarding the "Response to Amendment" section on page 2 of the Office Action and considering newly amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully note that the declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.131 includes a figure entitled, "Web Services via WTAS," which illustrates the application environment being disposed in a different network space than the service environment. The Internet user "L" and the Application "E" are illustratively shown as being in a different network space than the service environment, which is shown separately to the left of the Application environment. Pages 2, 3, and 4 of the disclosure further support the application environment being in a different space than the service environment. For example, Pages 3 and 4 refer to a service being a part of the service provider domain and outside Internet users using a browser with a web services application to locate and access services provided by the service provider. Accordingly, Applicants contend that Applicants' invention predates Lai when considering amended Claim 1.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited reference. One embodiment of the invention, as illustrated by amended Claim 1, is a method for providing Web services. The method can include registering a Web service with a service registry; conveying the Web service to a service provider; and installing the Web service within a service environment. Additionally, the method can include receiving a request for the Web service from a service user, wherein the user has selected the Web service from the service registry, wherein said request is received within an application server disposed within an application environment, and wherein said application environment is disposed within a different network space than said service environment.

The method can further include executing a servlet to establish a communication pathway between the application server and a gateway; conveying service-initiating information to the gateway, the service-initiating information specifying the requested Web service; initiating a component within said gateway that is specific to the Web service; accessing said requested Web service across the gateway by utilizing the component; conveying information from the Web service via the gateway to the application server; and transporting service data for said Web service from the application server disposed in said application environment to the service user. (See e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0011]-[0013] and [0037]-[0039]; See also FIG. 3)

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, and, 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application 2005/0044197 to Lai (hereinafter Lai). Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended Claim 1 so as to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention and expedite prosecution.

Lai discloses a system and method for *providing a generic, vendor-independent Web Services architecture* incorporating a structured methodology and design patterns for *designing and implementing* Web Services. (See paragraph [0059]). In contrast, Applicants' invention involves a method and system for providing web services from a service environment with a gateway. The Office Action asserts that paragraphs [0211-0214], [0216], [0239], [0241], and [0278] of Lai teach Applicants' feature of conveying a Web service to a service provider. However, the cited portions state that service providers define service description and configuration information and coding implementations. The cited portions also state that service providers use WSDL to describe a business service and configuration to implement a business service and that service providers create and provide business services. Nevertheless, there is no mention of Web services being *conveyed to a service provider*. Accordingly, Lai fails to disclose conveying a Web Service to a service provider.

Also, Lai fails to disclose executing a servlet to establish a communication pathway *between the application server and a gateway*. Lai discloses a controller servlet for handling requests from a service requester's browser or mobile device and the use of gateways. (See paragraphs [0413] and [0422]). Notably, the gateways in Lai are used for invoking applications running on legacy mainframes and for executing trade orders. (See paragraph [0422]). However, the feature of executing a servlet to establish a pathway between an application server and a gateway does not necessarily flow from merely including the use of such components in the prior art. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original). Chapter 2112.IV., Manual of Patent Examination Procedure (emphasis added). Lai further fails to disclose conveying service-initiating information to a gateway. The cited portions do not even discuss gateways, let alone conveying service-initiating information to a gateway. In addition, Lai fails to disclose initiating a component within a gateway that is specific to the requested Web service and accessing the requested Web Service across the

gateway by utilizing the component. The cited portions in Lai refer to security components, service components, and integration components and governing the access level of the components, but do not teach initiating components, which are *specific to a requested web service, within a gateway*. Lai further fails to disclose conveying information from the Web service via the gateway to the application server. As shown in FIGS. 20-21 of Lai, information from a requested Web service is not conveyed via the gateway to the application server.

Accordingly, Lai fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 defines over the prior art. Independent Claims 26, 32, and 37 likewise define over the prior art for similar reasons as amended Claim 1. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claims 1, 26, 32, or 37 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: December 31, 2008

/Gregory A. Nelson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000